

FEB 5 - 1947

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 40, NO. 6

December 2, 1946

WHOLE NO. 1054

NIHIL EST QUOD LATINE DICI NON POSSIT (Beach)

REVIEWS

CLARKE, Greek Studies in England, 1700-1830 . . . (Wallace)

DE LAET, De Samenstelling van den Romeinschen Senaat (Goodfellow)

**GERMAN AND ITALIAN PUBLICATIONS IN CLASSICS,
1940-1945 (Continued)**

AUSPICIUM MELIORIS AEVI!

A well-tested LATIN SERIES which covers fully the best recommendations
for the high school course

FIRST YEAR LATIN by Smith-Thompson

LATIN WORKBOOK by Thompson-Peters

SECOND YEAR LATIN by Scudder

THIRD YEAR LATIN by Kelsey-Meinecke

FOURTH YEAR LATIN by Carlisle-Richardson

CLASSICAL MYTHS by Herzberg

covers every allusion to mythology
which occurs in the LATIN SERIES.

ALLYN AND BACON

Boston

New York

Chicago

Atlanta

Dallas

San Francisco

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (on Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-two issues.

Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: Bennett Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 4, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

Edward H. Heffner, Editor, Bennett Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 4, Pennsylvania.

Franklin B. Krauss, Secretary and Treasurer, The Pennsylvania State College, Box 339, State College, Pennsylvania.

Associate Editor, Wm. C. McDermott; Contributing Editors: Charles T. Murphy, J. C. Plumpe, Lionel Casson.

Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price. For residents of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, or the District of Columbia, a subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY (or, alternatively, to The Classical Journal) is included in the membership fee of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, whose members are also entitled to The Classical Outlook and The Classical Journal at special prices in combinations available from the Secretary.

Entered as second-class matter November 7, 1945, at the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 40 contains issues dated: October 14, 21, 28; November 4, 18; December 2, 9, 16 (1946); January 6, 13, 20, 27; February 3, 10, 24; March 3, 10, 24; April 14, 21; May 5, 12, (1947).

NIHIL EST QUOD LATINE DICI NON POSSIT¹

When recently I read in the papers of the difficulties that the experts at San Francisco were experiencing with some of the languages in translating the proceedings and decisions, I smiled wryly.

'Trusteeship' seemed to be a sticker. Most of the languages, according to the report that I read, lack the term. I thought: if, then, a language is modern, it must have terms for modern things; if it has not, then it can not be modern. Hence French and Arabic are not modern languages. If, however, it has them, then it must be modern. Hence Latin is a modern language, for the Romans knew the institution of 'trusteeship', the terminology revolving around the words *fides* and *tutela*, and expressing in a variety of ways both 'entrusting' and 'receiving in trust'. It would be an interesting exercise to translate into Latin that document. I shall not try it here, for this is not a class in Cicero or in the Corpus Iuris. Anyhow, Latin is a modern tongue, and let us insist on that point of view.

'...That is why it would be really easier to learn five related languages at once than five disparate ones in as many tries. The idea of learning language groups is in the air and may yet bring fruit. Of course, there is one language—though it may be rude to mention it—which was once taught, and which is still a very good introduction to a fairly large group. I mean L-t-n. It was dropped like a dead thing when the Classics went under for the third time, about twenty years ago. But I see no reason why it should not be revived.

'At the very least the threat should be used to make the modern languages bestir themselves in school and college. Which is the dead language, anyhow, Latin with its admirable regular structure impressible on the mind, and its roots in daily use, or the hypothetical French that no child speaks, reads, or ever hears well spoken? Traditional ways of teaching Latin might be reformed—for example, Caesar is no first-year reading

subject. Try Ovid, or even Vergil. But I have said enough. I want to change the subject and modulate to the great ideas that language holds embalmed. Vergil's name is a fitting turning point, modulation incarnate.' Jacques Barzun, *Teacher in America*, pp. 146-7. Eighth printing, Aug. 1945.

So, Latin is a modern tongue, for in serious matters it meets the test better than several modern languages. Indeed, it might have been simpler to have agreed on Latin as the official language of the Convention, or better, of the charter or document, and let each national group translate it into their own tongue.

I shall not dwell on some of the later inventions, such as electronics, or on the newer chemistry. I do not know what those who speak in the special jargons are talking about, and am not at all certain that it is English, anyway. But if for English ears, when the product was discovered such a term as diethyl-dimethyl-diamido-arseno-benzol or dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane can be considered English and become acceptable, then we can take liberties with Latin under the same conditions, although, could Cicero hear such a term, he would probably exclaim: PROH DI IMMORTALES, ABSIT OMEN! NOLI TAM IMPIA, TAM DIRA, TAM EXSECRABILIA VERBA EFFUTIRE. In any event, the term would be no more cumbersome or more cacophonous. Thus, by that test, Latin is modern.

How then about business? Last year I saw a statement by Professor Norman J. De Witt that he felt it was just as well not to try to speak of business in Latin. I took up the gage. 'Oh, yeah', quoth I, *ain vero?*² *inquam*. I then sent him sixteen pages of business terms. They included 'a joint account', *ratio coniunctim habita*;² 'to contract with someone at so much a foot', *cum aliquot nummis in pedem transigere*;³ 'business is on the skids', *negotia decoquunt*;⁴ 'business is booming', *negotia mihi prospere, pulcherrime procedunt*;⁵ 'to buy for a song', *tittibilicio emere*;⁶ 'a letter

of credit', *viaticum*;⁷ 'a person so provided', *viaticatus*;⁸ 'pin money', *vindemiola*.⁹ And, of all things!, we learn that there must have been in Rome war-workers, for they speak of itchy cash that 'burnt holes in their pockets'. Plautus makes a character in the *Poenulus* say: 'I have a wad that's itching to be spent', *sunt mihi intus nescioquot nummi aurei lymphatici*.¹⁰ Well, Professor De Witt got out of it by saying that he meant: in class.

So much for the serious side, politics, law, and business. As to daily chit-chat and conversation, Latin can be, nay, is, as modern as any language. We have all probably had the experience of learning that the German and French that we have learned in school is utterly unlike the language that those people speak daily. You can't begin to get on in German until you learn to say: *Ach, das ist colossal*; and interlard your conversation with *vortrefflich* and *ausserordentlich schoen*. And, as for French, you do not speak the language until you can say *Que c'est epatant!* or *C'est vraiment rigolo*. You would probably get a bad mark in school for using those words instead of *Cela m'amuse extraordinairement* or *cela est merveilleux*. Latin was no different. The Romans had their pet phrases, too. Cicero's Letters are a veritable mine. Plautus, Terence, Horace, even Tacitus, all are suggestive. If you are asked in Latin, 'Are you ready to go?', the reply is not, *nondum volo abire*, which is too correct!, but *nondum suave est abire*.¹¹

Let us drop back for a moment. When the chairman of the Speaker's Committee, whose duty it was to secure speakers for the day, asked me to speak, although I had expected to be a listener, as he seemed 'to be in quite a dither' about it, I consented. While he was diplomatically and gently leading me into the net, a phrase by Cicero popped into my head. It might be a little strong for the Chairman's state of mind, but it is reasonably applicable. Cicero says that someone whom he had seen 'was in a terrible dither', *non hominem vidi sed scopas solutas*.¹² Now, I think an untied broom is a lovely term for a person 'in a dither' or 'at his wit's end'.

But let us turn to boasting for a moment. The Romans were well supplied with suitable terms, some of which, to be sure, were borrowed from the Greeks. Of these, certain ones were, it seems, blind to landlubbers. Cicero comments on this in a letter to Atticus, for when once on a boat he heard the cry, *inhibete remis!*,¹³ he expected to see the rowers set their oars so as to arrest the boat's progress; but no! they backwatered. He then remarks on the obscurity of technical terms to outsiders. We can take comfort that Cicero, *quo nemo sermonis Latini peritior*, could at times misunderstand Latin. It seems, too, that the Romans had 'rocking-chair' admirals. Livy in reporting a

speech by Aemilius, in which he requested no comments from self-constituted experts, has him say, *e terra ne <quis> gubernaverit*.¹⁴

Now let us turn to the speech of everyday life. We say that somebody looked perfectly cold and expressionless, or that he had a 'deadpan'. The Romans, I should judge, had on occasions the same expression. If I said that somebody looked at me in that fashion, the phrase would run as follows, *me ore frigefactato contuebatur*, or more simply, *os frigefactavit*.¹⁵ By the way, all the phrases that I employ, although not precise quotations but adapted to the context, are strictly Roman and not of my own contriving. If anyone was embarrassed, *os perfricuit*.¹⁶ But enough of the Roman's face, and to other parts of his anatomy! If he had had a 'big night' and was suffering a 'hangover', *gravedinibus crapulae laborabat*.¹⁷ Like some of us, the Romans went 'upstage' and 'high-hat'. In Plautus' the Curculio the soldier, Therapontigonus, was such an one. On his becoming arrogant and disagreeable in an argument, Curculio remarks of him, *ut fastidit gloriosus!*¹⁸ Then, in Plautus' Miles Gloriosus, Pyrgopolinices, the great braggart and coward, always thought first of 'Number One', *semper erat proximus ipse sibi*;¹⁹ yet who can doubt but that, had he gotten into a real fight, he would have 'burst a lung' running, *ramites currendorupisset?*²⁰

Roman husbands seem to have the same difficulty in understanding their wives' peculiar ways that we Americans occasionally experience, for they shrug their shoulders and pass off something past understanding thus, *ita est ingenium muliebre*. Sometimes Roman women regretted that they were but weak women; were they men, 'they'd show 'em'. Then they exclaimed, *teste Terentio: virum me natam vellem: ego ostenderem*.²¹

So, now we come to the women. The first thing we men can learn is that we might as well give over 'grousing' about the peculiar ways of our womenfolk and spend the time cultivating our patience. Not only is *ingenium muliebre ita*, but it is just the same *ingenium* that it was 2300 years ago and, I'll hazard the guess, for a much longer time. Aside from the usual toilet, where they brush their hair, *capillos comunt* and *pectunt*; and their teeth, *dentes fricant*, or *purgant*, they had curling irons, *calamistros*, and they curled their hair with them, *capillos crispabant*, or *torquebant*. Sometimes they 'went really to town' and got 'a permanent', *capillos vibrandos curabant*.²² I guess, moreover, that they spent as much time on their toilet as do our women, for one of Terence's characters becoming impatient hanging around waiting for his wife's appearance, fumes that her toilet takes a year, *nostri mores mulierum, dum moliuntur, 'while they fuss', dum conantur, annus est*.²³ They used whitening, *creta*, and

face paint, *offucia*, and several colors of rouge, did things to their nails, and Heaven knows what not, besides! Both sexes could take showers, in *balneis pensilibus*.²⁴

Roman women got mad at their husbands, had tantrums and the sulks. Then they locked themselves in their rooms and sent back the dinner that the embarrassed husband sent up; see Cic. Ad Att. 5. 1. 4. Cicero says, *quae mihi maiori stomacho fuerunt quam ipsi Quinto*. He infers that Quintus was accustomed to this treatment. You see, his wife was Atticus' sister and Marcus wished Atticus to give her a 'talking-to'. Nobody seemed to know what had irked her, *nemo causas scordaliarum vel odorari vel expiscari poterat*,²⁵ except that, arriving at the villa, Quintus asked her to do something, and she snapped back, *hic hospita sum*, 'I'm just a guest here', and flounced off to her room and locked herself in. Although Quintus took it all very quietly, doubtless he felt like a 'perfect ass', *non dubium est quin se esse asinum germanum sentierit*.²⁶ Perhaps he 'had been too soft' with his wife, *fortasse uxorem nimis delicatam habuerat*,²⁷ and was not smart enough to say diplomatically, 'by your leave', or 'if you don't mind', *pace tua*, or *bona venia tua*, or *nisi tibi est incommodum*. She had probably gotten into the shrewish way of saying, 'I won't, and that is that', *id non faciam*. *Definitum est*.²⁸ If he had, it might 'have been another story', *alia esse potuit oratio*.²⁹

There were many saucy maids and impudent men-servants. They 'talked back', *responsabant*. We apparently don't know too much about their games. We do know that they had ball games. Horace tells us. They certainly 'played catch', *pila datatim ludebant*.³⁰

When Romans made nasty remarks they did it with the same verve and abandon to which we are accustomed. One might think that they were translating from the English. Likewise when 'the conversation turned to sweethearts', *cum de deliciis vibrarent sermones*,³¹ 'everyone loved to say that his honey had everything', *suave erat dicere mel suum omnia habere*. Ovid says, *haec habet, ut dicas, quicquid in orbe fuit*,³² 'that you may say she has everything in the world'. Tacitus says, in the same vein, of Poppaea Sabina, *huic mulieri cuncta alia fuere praeter honestum animum*.³³ Even the modern and, so far as I know, very modern 'mouse', for 'sweetheart', finds its counterpart in the Roman *mus*, for 'sweetheart'.

In counselling Roman lads to say complimentary things to their lasses, Ovid advises, even though you think her dress an atrocity, to tell her 'she's a knock-out and a ball of fire', *moves incendia*.³⁴ When a girl is 'too fond of clothes' and 'a fancy dresser', *nimio vestitui indulget*.³⁵ In that case, she may 'make an easy mark of you', but what of it?, *quid si depeculatui habetis*?³⁶ For still, 'in that way you sell yourself to the girls', *istotique modo puellis te venditas*.³⁷

Although Petronius is a mine of phrases, I feel that we must be careful in adopting them without thoroughly weighing them, as he was in many instances probably imitating the local dialect or using distinct vulgarisms. Some, however, have a characteristic Roman tang and are worth adopting without second thought. Certainly his phrase, *fortis tanquam Orcus*³⁸ has a modern American ring and we should not hesitate to adopt it. In the case of Plautus and Terence no such care need be exercised and certainly not in Cicero's usage, provided we employ language suited to the time and place, a principle which, of course, must be understood under any and all circumstances and in all languages. If you are a wee bit doubtful of the propriety of your phrase, you can always subjoin *honoris prae-fandi causa*, 'if I may say so', or 'with all due respect', or 'you may say', *honor sit auribus*.

Not only do we find Cicero's correspondence full of business terms but we find many that seem to our ears quite slangy. Once, when he was pleased with some action of the Senate, we find him saying to Atticus, *divinus senatus fuit in supplicatione deneganda*.³⁹ That, of course, may not have been slang to a Roman, but to us it seems so, and surely it meets our needs, in some cases, beautifully.

The Roman leave-taking was strangely like ours. So often we hear, 'Anything else on your mind?' 'No, take it easy'. In the same way they heard, *numquid me vis?*, or *numquid aliud?*, to which the answer was likely to be, *otiose ambula*, or *clementer ambula*.

The Roman seems always to have a proverb of homely sort 'on the tip of his tongue', in *extremis labiis*, just as had the New Englanders of past generations. Wasted time or effort seemed to worry them. This was expressed in innumerable ways as, 'talking into the wind', 'talking to a deaf ass', 'carrying water in a sieve', 'trying to fill a broken bottle', 'looking for a laurel wreath in a cake' (they probably had no public institution to give prizes for cooking and preserving), 'washing bricks', 'sowing seed in the sand', and 'writing in water'.

When the Roman 'killed two birds with one stone', he 'whitewashed two walls with one pot of whitewash'. I suppose that also meant spreading it thin or 'chiseling', *duo parietes de una fidelia dealbare*.⁴⁰ They seem not to have esteemed highly the other people's business man, for they quoted of such, *fundum alienum arant, incultum familiarem deserunt*.⁴¹ Ovid tells us that the grass in the next pasture always looks greener, as he uses these words, *fertilior seges est alienis semper in agris*.⁴² Horace, whose *aurea mediocritas* bade every one be satisfied with his lot, thus describes dissatisfaction, 'the lazy ox yearns for a saddle, the cart horse longs for the plough', *optat ephippia bos piger, optat*

aratra
was
dente
in a
citab
crabr
moth
the b
Thos
in ea
Cicer
cetera
gran
thou
the c
'ther
jingle
rose
Whe
prox
apple
W
we a
phra
prop
will,
quoc
N
fair-
whit
APU
NU

17
The
It w
Class
Phila
and
20
30
47
50
6F
W.
ensis
7F
8F
90
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

aratra caballus.⁴³ 'Looking a gift horse in the mouth' was taboo in this categoric statement, *equi donati dentes non inspiciuntur*.⁴⁴ Whereas we 'raise a tempest in a teapot', they 'raised waves in a spoon', *fluctus excitabant in simpulo*.⁴⁵ 'Don't disturb a hornets' nest', *crabrones ne irriterentur*.⁴⁶ Some Romans, probably mothers, paedagogi, and schoolteachers 'had eyes in the back of their heads', *in occipitio oculos habebant*.⁴⁷ Those who amongst us 'are in the same boat', in Rome *in eadem navi erant*.⁴⁸ 'Bad beginnings', according to Cicero, 'have bad endings', *ut male posuimus initia; sic cetera sequuntur*.⁴⁹ Although they did not teach their grandmothers to 'suck eggs', they achieved the same thought by saying, 'the legs are trying to climb into the couch', *fulmenta lectulum scandunt*.⁵⁰ In saying 'there are no roses without thorns', they had a homely jingle, *ubi uber, ibi tuber*,⁵¹ and they spoke of 'the rose among the thorns', *inter vepres rosae nascuntur*.⁵² Where there is smoke there is fire, *flamma fumo est proxima*.⁵³ When things went badly 'they upset the apple-cart', in almost our words, *plostrum perculerunt*.⁵⁴

When we undertake to extend good wishes in Latin, we are often inclined to fall into some cumbersome phrase but Cicero in writing to Atticus gives us the proper Roman phrase for 'Merry Saturnalia', or, if you will, 'Merry Christmas', *Hilara sane Saturnalia militibus quoque quibus . . . reliquam praedam concessimus*.⁵⁵

Now 'Fortune's favorite child', in other words, 'the fair-haired boy', became strangely, 'the son of the white hen', *gallinae filius albae*.⁵⁶ ITAQUE UT APUD VOS GALLINAE FILIUS ALBAE SIM, NUNC TACEBO. DEFINITUM EST.

NOTES

¹This paper was delivered before the Connecticut Section of The Classical Association of New England on Oct. 20, 1945. It was also presented at the Joint Meeting of The American Classical League, The Philadelphia Classical Society, and The Philadelphia Classical Club held in Philadelphia on Dec. 7 and 8, 1945.

²Caesar B.G. 6.19.

³Cf. Cicero, Pro Rosc. Am. 39. 114; Verr. 2. 1 (54). 140.

⁴Tert., Apol. 42: templorum vectigalia cotidie decoquunt.

⁵Cicero, Ad Fam. 12. 9. 2; Phil. 13. 19. 40.

⁶Plautus, Cas. 347; the references are to the edition by W. M. Lindsay [Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis].

⁷Frequent in Classical Latin.

⁸Plautus, Men. 255.

⁹Cicero, Ad Att. 1. 10. 4.

¹⁰Plautus, Poen. 345.

¹¹Cf. Petron. 33.

¹²Cicero, Ad Att. 7. 13a. 6.

¹³Cicero, Ad Att. 13. 21. 3.

¹⁴Livy 44. 22. 14.

¹⁵Plautus, Poen. 760.

¹⁶Cicero, Tusc. Disp. 3. 18. 41.

¹⁷Pliny, N. H. 20. 13 [51]. 136.

¹⁸Plautus, Curc. 633.

¹⁹Cf. also Ter. And. 635; the references are to the edition by R. Y. Tyrrell [Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis].

²⁰Cf. Plautus, Poen. 540.

²¹Ter. Phorm. 792.

²²Cf. Verg. Aen. 12. 99; Pliny, N. H. 2. 78 (80), 189.

²³Ter. Heaut. 240.

²⁴Pliny, N. H. 9. 54 (79). 168.

²⁵See the dictionaries.

²⁶Cf. Cicero, Ad Att. 4. 5. 3.

²⁷Cf. Plautus, Men. 119.

²⁸Plautus, Cist. 519.

²⁹Cf. Plautus, Merc. 383.

³⁰Plautus, Curc. 296.

³¹Cf. Petron. 67.

³²Ovid, A. A. 1. 56.

³³Tac. Ann. 13. 45.

³⁴Ovid, A. A. 2. 301.

³⁵Cf. Ter. Adel. 63.

³⁶Cf. Plautus, Epid. 520.

³⁷Cf. Cicero, Ad Att. 1. 16. 16; also *vendito* in the dictionaries.

³⁸Chap. 62.

³⁹Cicero, Ad Quint. Frat. 2. 6(8).

⁴⁰Cicero, Ad Fam. 7. 29.

⁴¹Plautus, Asin. 874.

⁴²Ovid, A. A. 1. 349.

⁴³Epist. 1. 14. 43.

⁴⁴Hier. Epist. 1. 14. 43.

⁴⁵Cicero, De Leg. 3. 16. 36.

⁴⁶Plautus, Amph. 707.

⁴⁷Plautus, Aul. 64.

⁴⁸Cicero, Ad Fam. 2. 5. 1.

⁴⁹Cicero, Ad Att. 10. 18. 2.

⁵⁰Varro, ap. Non. 206. 25.

⁵¹Cf. Apul. Flor. 18; edit. by J. van der Vliet (Teubner, 1900), p. 180. l. 12; edit. by Helm (Teubner, 1910), p. 35. l. 3.

⁵²Amm. 16. 7. 4.

⁵³Plautus, Curc. 53.

⁵⁴Plautus, Epid. 593.

⁵⁵Cicero, Ad Att. 5. 20. 5.

⁵⁶Juv. 13. 141.

GOODWIN B. BEACH

HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

REVIEWS

Greek Studies in England, 1700 - 1830. By M. L. CLARKE. 255 pages. (Cambridge, at the University Press; New York, The Macmillan Company, 1945) \$4.50.

This is the kind of book one would expect to be dull. Sandy's invaluable History of Classical Scholarship, which, with a much wider scope and different purpose, still covers the same field, is as dull as it is useful. But Mr. Clark's easy, occasionally epigrammatic, style, his firm grip on essentials and his equally firm avoidance of irrelevant detail, make his book very pleasant to read. The great period of English scholarship, when England's Classical scholars were the

acknowledged masters of Europe, emerges clear in the reader's mind—the new secular emphasis, the preëminence of textual studies over all others, the wide-spread appreciation of Greek poetry, the strange blind spots of scholars and public alike for Greek art, philosophy, and history, stand out clearly above the mass of detail, which is all one finds in Sandys. Not that the detail is lacking here (nearly a thousand names, at a rough estimate, appear in the index), but it is surprisingly unobtrusive, and the book can be read aloud with pleasure.

Greek poetry probably enjoyed a wider popularity in England during the period under review than it has since, or is likely to do for some time to come. Mr. Clarke tells a pleasant story about George the Fourth who 'could produce a Homeric quotation suitable to the occasion, as when Dr. Davies of Eton, somewhat drunk after dinner, said to him, "What do you know of Homer? I bet you don't know a line of the Iliad." The Prince of Wales, as he then was, immediately quoted a line beginning with the word *Οἶνοβαρές*'. A knowledge of Homer was apparently almost as widespread among English gentlemen as it had been two thousand years before among Athenian *καλοὶ καγαθοὶ* (though, doubtless, less intimate). Greek poetry influenced the English poets deeply whether they were scholars or ignorant of Greek, but in both cases, one feels, rather more in the letter than in the spirit. Cowper provided the natural reaction to Pope's ornate and self-conscious translation, his Iliad and Odyssey being bare and simple to a vice. It may be pointed out, however, that his versions of the Greek Anthology are still among the best in English. Perhaps the fact that scholars were too preoccupied with the texts to concern themselves much with literary criticism is responsible for what cannot but seem to us, after all allowance is made for changing fashion, the rather superficial appreciation of a period which was largely blind to the merits of Aischylos while it inordinately admired Lykophron.

The antiquarianism of the period—so different from modern archaeology—is the subject of several interesting chapters. At the beginning of the eighteenth century there were no museums in the modern sense: the British Museum was not founded until 1753, and it was not until the nineteenth century that public collections became really important. The eighteenth and the early portion of the nineteenth century was thus a golden age of private collecting. But the wealthy and well-travelled connoisseur relished the bizarre and the curious as much or more than the significant and the beautiful. He did not usually specialize but picked up unsystematically whatever happened to catch his fancy. And while usually well-educated, he was seldom given to 'study' in the grim Teutonic sense. Thus enthusiasm

rather than sound knowledge resulted from the energetic and well-informed but diffuse collecting of the eighteenth century, and even Sir William Hamilton, in the early years of the nineteenth, employed the 'semi-impostor' d'Hancarville to prepare the letterpress of his first publication of Greek vases. His devotion, however, to these then unfashionable antiquities secured for England the nucleus of the British Museum's fine collection (as well as being perhaps the chief reason why he was able to remain to the end the firm friend of Nelson). It is perhaps fair to say that it was only in the study of Greek architecture—conducted for the most part by professional architects rather than by dilettanti—that the writings (as opposed to the collections) of the eighteenth century made important additions to our knowledge of the material remains of ancient Greece. The exceptional brilliance of architectural studies is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that conditions in Greece (where, for instance, there were no inns of any kind to receive the traveller) were most unfavourable for the archaeologist.

A virtue, obviously, of such a book as this is that it sharpens and clarifies one's impressions of the period. It is no surprise to any of us to be told that Greek learning in the eighteenth century was much Romanized. But it is easy to forget that there were no Greek-English dictionaries until about a hundred and twenty years ago—so that his ignorance of Latin was a serious handicap to John Stuart Mill when he began Greek at the age of three. The latinizing of Greek names is a bad legacy which we are only slowly rejecting (how sound Grote's judgment was in this matter as in so many others!), but few of us realize the lengths to which it was quite recently carried. As Mr. Clarke says, 'It is no surprise to find Pope writing Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva for Zeus, Hera, and Athene, but it is rather a shock to find Shelley following the same practise.' And most of us still write 'Athena'.

That professorships and fellowships were frequently sinecures in the eighteenth century is a commonplace. Most of us know (thanks in some cases to Mr. Clarke's little book on Porson) that Porson as Professor of Greek gave no lectures at all, spending much time on such *πάρεργα* as drinking, versification, and (to our great advantage) calligraphy. But it is interesting that Scotland's inferiority to England in Classical scholarship during the period under consideration may perhaps be explained by her lack of a leisured clergy and by the fact that 'as regards Greek, at any rate, not only were the Scottish professors forced to teach, but they were forced to teach the elements of their subject'. Absit omen!

As one closes the book it is with an acute feeling of how times have changed. Among modern English scholars only Housman seems to fall naturally into the

sequence; of the matters which concerned the scholars of the eighteenth century perhaps only Homer is of similar concern to-day. To some extent this is because the eighteenth century did its work so well: our texts are now mostly in presentable condition, and when a great scholar spends his labour upon textual criticism we cannot help feeling that Manilius, or even Juvenal, is hardly worth his trouble. But the real reason for the difference lies in the temper of the times. A generation accustomed to the worship of science finds the method of the archaeologist more impressive than a Bentley's 'divinandi quaedam peritia et *μαρτυρία*'. Scholars trained in the ways of *Altertumswissenschaft* think rather of contributing a column to Pauly-Wissowa than of writing universal history. It is a natural temptation to conclude that we are pygmies beside the giants of the past. And yet our knowledge of ancient Greece is generally wide and sound in comparison with theirs. If most of us know our Greek metres (and indeed our Greek) less well, still few of us in meeting for the first time sculptures comparable to those of the Parthenon could be persuaded that they were second-rate Hadrianic work; few of us think of Plato chiefly as a moralist and poet; no one writes history chiefly for its anecdotes and 'examples', good and bad. It remains true that the interests of the great period are in many small ways very modern. Written examinations, the invention of Samuel Butler, are much with us; the same arguments about the pronunciation of ancient Greek are still repeated with the same bitterness; publication is still often motivated by the desire for preferment rather than by the love of learning. The book, in short, is as provocative as it is informative.

WILLIAM WALLACE

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

De Samenstelling van den Romeinschen Senaat gedurende de eerste eeuw van het Principaat (28 vóór Chr.-68 na Chr.) By SIEGFRIED J. DE LAET. 338 pages. (Rijksuniversiteit te Gent. Werken uitgegeven door de Faculteit van de Wijsbegeerte en Letteren. 92e aflevering. Antwerpen 1941)

This study of the composition of the Roman Senate during the Julio-Claudian dynasty is divided into three parts. The first is a list and short summary of the *cursus honorum* of the individual members of the Roman Senate during this period. The list is arranged alphabetically according to each important emperor (Augustus, Tiberius, Claudius, Nero) with two groups under each of *certi* and *incerti*. The biographical material is taken from PIR (*Prosopographia Imperii Romani*) and RE (*Paulys Real-Encyclopädie*), with the addition of information published later than these works and a critical examination of each item.

The second part is composed of lists on which the final conclusions are based. First are *alba senatoria*, that is, official lists of the Senate in which the senators are arranged according to their rank, years of service, etc. The years 20 B.C. and A.D. 14, 37, 42, 54, and 68 were chosen for these summaries to show the evolution of the Senate during each reign. The second list is that of all patrician senators, of which there are 141 under Augustus, 107 under Tiberius, 81 under Claudius, and 54 under Nero. There is also a list of senators of Italian origin for each reign and *fasti* of the provinces.

The third part consists of conclusions which the author has drawn from the material assembled in the first two parts. The most striking fact about the patrician group is, of course, its marked and rapid decay. The families of the old Republican patriciate as well as new ones created by Caesar, Augustus, and Claudius declined rapidly, so that under Augustus they contributed 29% of the Senate but under Nero only 12%. Three main causes are adduced; immorality, economic decline, and conflicts with the principate. Not merely the number of patrician senators but their influence in that body is important. Senators were called on to express their views according to rank so that for practical purposes only consular senators had the privilege of speaking. A comparison of the percentage of patricians among the consulars is therefore revealing. In A.D. 14, 45% of the consulars were patricians, a fact which leads to the conclusion that Augustus systematically favored this group. Tiberius' attitude differed, and plebeians found it much easier to attain the consulship. Under Claudius an effort was made again to strengthen the nobles so that their influence increased and new families were admitted. In spite of this, the numbers continued to diminish. Nero seems to have been indifferent to the problem.

A chapter examines the plebeian senators, especially the *homines novi*. Augustus admitted many new men to the Senate, especially prominent equites from Italian municipalities. This was a final stage in the unification of Italy, whereby all important Italian cities had a representative in the Senate. Augustus also reinforced the number of his partisans in this body in this way. But only a small number of these new members reached high office, for, as usually, Augustus respected Republican tradition. Tiberius admitted fewer new families to the Senate, but plebeian influence increased at the expense of the patriciate. Especially during the last ten years of his reign, numerous *homines novi* reached the consulship. Claudius returned to the policy of Augustus; Nero introduced many new members of provincial origin.

This topic of the introduction of senators of provincial origin receives further study in a separate

chapter. Two points of special interest are stressed. In spite of the famous speech of Claudius in A.D. 48 in favor of admitting certain Aeduans to the Senate, we find no trace of them before Trajan. The author attributes this to the fact that Claudius' wish to honor the natives of his birthplace (Lugdunum) was premature, since the province was not sufficiently Romanized at that time. It is also notable that under Nero a great change in policy took place. There were 42 senators of provincial origin as compared with 15 under Claudius. These came to a large extent from the western provinces. It was Nero, and not Vespasian, who was the innovator in this respect. This change was caused by the social and economic crisis in Italy itself and the influence of Seneca, himself a man of provincial origin.

An examination of the fasti of the provinces reveals a policy of Tiberius different from that of other emperors. Under this emperor we find governors of senatorial provinces who remained in office two, three, four, and six years, and in imperial provinces the term of office was also unusually long. Ancient authors note this policy which seemed to the Senate an encroachment on its prerogatives and contributed to the unpopularity of Tiberius with that class. He followed the policy because it resulted in better government for the provincials and because there were few men of the senatorial class in whom he had complete confidence. He it was also who treated any abuses in provincial government with the utmost severity. A final chapter examines certain theories concerning the careers of patrician senators.

This work is written in Flemish but a résumé in French is provided, and on this the reviewer has had to depend for the most part. The list of men of senatorial rank is valuable as a work of reference to all scholars concerned with the period. With the two works of P. Lambrechts (*La composition du Sénat romain, de l'accession au trône d'Hadrien à la mort de Commode (117-192)*, Antwerp, 1936, and *La composition du Sénat romain de Septime-Sévère à Dioclétien (193-284)*, Budapest, 1937), and that of B. Stech (*Senatores Romani qui fuerint inde a Vespasiano usque ad Traiani exitum*, Klio, Beiheft, 1912), we now have detailed studies of the Senate for the first three centuries of the Empire. It would have been even more useful if the author had written his study in either French or Latin, but we are grateful to him for these results of his careful scholarship.

CHARLOTTE E. GOODFELLOW

WELLESLEY COLLEGE

GERMAN AND ITALIAN PUBLICATIONS

IN CLASSICS, 1940-1945

(Continued from page 40)

HINTZE, OTTO. *Zur Theorie der Geschichte*. Leipsic, Koehler. c1942. 237 pp. (Gesammelte Abhandlungen, II.Bd.).

JOLHER, FRANZ. *Von der Entscheidung, Reden, und Botschaften aus drei Jahrtausenden von Staatslenkern und Feldherren*. Berlin, Metzner. 1942. 205 pp.

MARCHESI, CONCETTO. *Motivi dell'epica antica*. Milan-Messina, G. Principato. 1942. 41 pp. 45-17224

MEREZHKOVSKII, DMITRII SERGEEVICH. *L'Atlantide*. 2 ed. Milan, Hoepli. 1941. 301 pp. 45-30444

PERSONE, LUIGI M. *Incontri, poeti e scrittori antichi e moderni*. Florence, F. Le Monnier. 1942. 253 pp. PQ4046.P3 45-12034

SALVATORELLI, LUIGI. *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana*. Milan, F. Vallardi. 1943. 329 pp. BR67.C3 1943 45-51860

SCHWARTZ, EDUARD. *Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman*. 2. Aufl. Berlin, de Gruyter. 1943. 156 pp.

TERZAGHI, NICOLA. *Storia della letteratura latina da Tiberio a Giustiniano*. Milan, F. Vallardi. 1941. 661 pp. PA6041.T4 1941 44-32368

USSANI, VINCENZO. *Storia della letteratura latina nelle età repubblicana e augustea*. Milan, F. Vallardi. 1942. 509 pp. PA6008.U8 45-12513

WALZ, ANGELUS MARIA. *Studi storiografici*. Rome, S.A.L.E.R. 1940. 72 pp. AC40-2414

WEBER, ALFRED. *Das tragische und die Geschichte*. Hamburg, Govert. 1943. 446 pp. LANGUAGE

BIONE, CESARE. *Vocabolario della lingua latina*. Milan, C. Signorelli. 1940. 1423 pp. 45-199956

CAMELLI, SERGIO. *Forme irregolari e dialettali della lingua greca*. Florence, F. Le Monnier. 1941. 201 pp. PA337.C3 44-52479

FINOCCHIARO, ALFIO. *Sintassi latina della proposizione e del periodo*. 5 ed. Bologna, Edizioni C.E.L.I. 1943. 1 vol.

FRIEDRICH, JOHANNES. *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*. 1. T. *Kurzgefasste Grammatik*. Heidelberg, Winter. 1940-. 1 vol. (Indogermanische Bibliothek. 1. Abt. Sammlung indogermanischer Lehr- und Handbücher. 1. Reihe. Grammatiken. 23. Bd.). P945-F75 43-46923

GEMOLL, WILHELM. *Vocabolario greco-italiano ad uso delle scuole*. 15 ed. Florence, Società anonima edizioni Remo Sandron. 1944. 880 pp. PA445.18G4 1944 45-14949

HABENSTEIN, ERNST. *Lateinische Sprachlehre*. 7. durchgesehene Aufl. Leipsic, Teubner. 1942. 192 pp. (Teubners lateinisches Unterrichtswerk). PA2087.H14 1942 44-20023

KAULHAUSEN, MARIE HED. *Die Typen des Sprechens*. Heidelberg, Winter. 1940. 67 pp. (Germanische Bibliothek. 2. Abt.: Untersuchungen und Texte. 43. Bd.). BF818.K3 41-26031